



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,156	10/17/2001	Adrianne Lewis	1248-R-01	5615

35811 7590 09/16/2003

IP DEPARTMENT OF PIPER RUDNICK LLP
3400 TWO LOGAN SQUARE
18TH AND ARCH STREETS
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

MYHRE, JAMES W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3622

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/981,156

Applicant(s)
Lewis

Examiner
James W. Myhre

Art Unit
3622



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James W. Myhre

(3) Darius Gambino

(2) Paul Taufer

(4) _____

Date of Interview Sep 11, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:
Von Kohorn (5,916,024)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Applicant Representatives argued that Von Kohorn does not disclose that the advertisements are incorporated into the actual game nor that the player is prompted to access an advertisement in order to play the game. It was stressed that the game was not started until the player interacted with the advertisement. The Examiner noted that Von Kohorn did disclose a game in which an advertisement is displayed to the player, who must the answers questions about the advertisement in order to "win" the prize, which may be the product or a coupon for the product. Proposed changes in the terminology of claim 1 was discussed which could better clarify what the initial advertisement consisted of and how it is was being used. The Examiner noted that, since this case is in an After Final status, an Advisory Action would most probably be issued, depending upon how the claim was amended, since an additional search may be required.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**JAMES W. MYHRE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3622**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required